

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 OKI AMERICA, INC., et al.,

No. C 04-03171 CRB

12 Plaintiffs,

ORDER

13 v.

14 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.,

15 Defendant.
16 _____/

17 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS
18 _____/

19 Now pending before the Court is plaintiffs' motion for permission to submit
20 defendant's mediation statement to a Japanese court. By letter dated January 18, 2006,
21 plaintiffs advised defendant that plaintiffs' motion to submit the mediation statement is moot.
22 Accordingly, plaintiffs' motion is DISMISSED. The Court did not review the mediation
23 statement that plaintiffs filed with the Court.

24 The Court notes that it only became aware of the mootness of plaintiffs' motion
25 because the Court happened to review defendant's motion to amend the protective order.
26 Plaintiffs are under an obligation to notify the Court of the mootness of one of their motions
27 immediately upon plaintiffs' determination that the motion is moot; otherwise, the Court's
28 scarce resources may be wasted. That plaintiffs believe defendant's motion to amend may
also be moot is irrelevant. As plaintiffs take the position (and this Court agrees) that the

1 motion they filed is moot, they should have immediately so notified the Court regardless of
2 whether defendant agrees that its own motion is also moot.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4
5 Dated: January 23, 2006



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California